

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated February 22, 2008 the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Matsuhara et al. (US Published Application No. 2004/0190045, hereinafter "Matsuhara"). No claims were allowed.

In rejecting claims 1-4, the Examiner identified paragraph [0031] of Matsuhara as disclosing the detection of image-only files. Paragraph [0047] was identified as disclosing directing data to a dedicated, PDF image-only pipeline processing path. Paragraph [0041] was identified as showing image decoding an image-only block of PDF data, and paragraph [0038] was identified as showing rendering for printing.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection based on Matsuhara by noting that Matsuhara is entirely directed to providing a user the selectable option of both copying, or printing, a document, while simultaneously, carrying out other processing of the file. Nowhere in paragraph [0031], or elsewhere in Matsuhara, is there any teaching of detecting and diverting image-only PDF files to a separate, unique, image-only processing path on their way to a printer.

Paragraph [0031] deals with the scanner controller, the output of which goes on one path only (see the output of box 24, Fig. 4).

Paragraph [0047] describes Matsuhara's system that allows a user to select what other functions might optionally be performed, simultaneously with printing, such as color conversion.

Paragraph [0041] describes the user interface for selecting from various conversion options available, simultaneously with printing, as does paragraph [0038].

Nowhere in Matsuhara is there any teaching or suggestion of applicants' claimed system for providing a more efficient, faster, printing path for a specific, limited, subset of PDF data, i.e., image-only data, that is detected in a PDF data stream en route to a printer. Applicants' invention employs an either-or selector that deflects only blocks of PDF data that are image-only, and not the other PDF data, to a dedicated PDF image-only pipeline. The other PDF data is handled conventionally. Simultaneous processing options, which is the entire focus of Matsuhara's system, are not a part of applicants' claimed invention.

To further clarify the differences between the present invention and Matsuhara, applicants have amended the claims. Independent claims 1 and 3 now include a description of the alternate paths to which PDF data is directed when employing the methods and systems of the present invention. Nothing in Matsuhara discloses, suggests, or teaches the invention defined in the amended claims.

This response is accompanied by a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) requesting a three-month extension, together with a deposit account authorization for the fee therefore.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, and ask that it be passed to issue.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit any deficiencies or overpayments in connection with this filing to Deposit Account No. 19-1457.

Date: 8/21/08

Respectfully submitted,

By: David C. Ripma

David C. Ripma,
Reg. No. 27,672

David C. Ripma, Patent Counsel
Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc.
5750 NW Pacific Rim Blvd.
Camas, WA 98607

Telephone: (360) 834-8754
Facsimile: (360) 817-8505